



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in doing all this he has made no new contribution to the subject. The book, however, is accurate and conveniently arranged, the discussion of each treaty being followed by a brief bibliography and an appendix of statistical and documentary material. At the same time, a tendency is exhibited in many places to incorporate picturesque descriptive matter, which makes very entertaining reading, but does not add to the scientific value of the work. The closing chapter of the volume is the reprint of an article upon the treaty-making power of the House of Representatives, originally published by the author in the *Yale Review* of August, 1903. The appendix to the Hawaiian treaty also contains a short discussion of economic conditions in the Hawaiian Islands at the time of their discovery by Captain Cook.

W. JETT LAUCK.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

---

*A History of the Commercial and Financial Relations between England and Ireland from the Period of the Restoration.*

By ALICE EFFIE MURRAY. London: P. S. King & Son, 1903. 8vo, pp. xvii + 486.

This book is the result of Miss Murray's work as a research student in the London School of Economics, where, as Mr. Hewins informs us in a brief preface which he contributes, she was one of the first two to obtain the doctorate. The importance of the subject of her investigations is out of all proportion to the attention that has been previously devoted to it. There is hardly any field of economic history about which less is known than about that of Ireland; and yet, as Miss Murray makes clear, the prostrate condition of that unhappy island during the past century and its unsettled political relations with England were in large measure the result of economic forces that were set in motion in the seventeenth century. Nor has Ireland been the only sufferer under these forces; England likewise, both directly and indirectly, has felt the baneful effects of her own fatuous policy. Indeed, every blow aimed at the prosperity of Ireland recoiled with a swiftness and sureness that are startling. The most shrewdly contrived laws enacted to foster the industry and commerce of the stronger country at the expense of the weaker brought nothing but disaster to both. Lord Melbourne once said of an Irish measure—it was the Catholic Emancipation Act, if we remember rightly, but it applies to many others—that when it was under discussion all

the wise men were on one side, and all the fools on the other, and all the fools were right. The English statecraft that blasted the welfare of a conquered neighbor was overwise; Nemesis stalked in the shadow of Nike, and England has paid dearly for the false conception of her own best interests.

Miss Murray aims to show, without the prejudice that destroys the value of most writings on Ireland, how their commercial and financial relations

have powerfully reacted on the history of the two countries and on their political life; to explain how the commercial policy of England affected the economic condition of Ireland, and by throwing the mass of the people on the land aggravated the later agrarian troubles; to set forth how this same commercial policy, combined with the penal laws, caused a grievous deterioration of the national character, to which even the present poverty and backwardness of Ireland may be traced.

She begins with the period of the Restoration, because a new phase of English commercial policy began then. Until that time Irish resources had been little developed, and contempt rather than goodwill had restrained England from imposing commercial restrictions; but circumstances were altered by Ireland's recovery and rapid progress during the peace of the Commonwealth.

The first hostile measure was the Cattle Act of 1663, supplemented by that of 1666. This was adopted mainly for political and personal reasons, among which hatred of the Duke of Ormonde seems to have been uppermost. It prohibited the import of Irish cattle to England, thus stopping the chief source of Irish wealth. The results of it were unforeseen. It forced the Irish into the trade in provisions, hides, and tallow, so that they became strong competitors abroad with the English provision merchants; it caused a rapid growth of Irish shipping; it materially lessened the import of English goods; and, most important of all, it encouraged sheep-raising and the export of wool to England; and when the price of wool fell with increasing supplies, it promoted the growth of the Irish manufacture of woollens. This growth was further assisted by cheap labor and low taxes, and there was actually some immigration of English skill and capital. Alarmed at the prospect, the government of England in 1699 absolutely prohibited the export of Irish woollens abroad, while maintaining a prohibitory duty on them in England. In consequence, many manufacturers emigrated to the continent; Irish wool was smuggled abroad; and a strong impetus was thus given to the industry in

foreign countries. Subsequent acts suppressed the manufacture of cotton, glass, silk, beer, and other things, while the attempt to foster the production of linen was of little avail till after 1750. By this industrial policy England fatally crippled the Protestant interest, and lost the opportunity to make of Ireland a loyal, Protestant state.

In the meantime the Navigation Act fell heavily on the merchant marine. Ireland's shipping decreased until it sufficed for no more than one-eighth of her trade. Agriculture was backward, and pasturage increased at the expense of tillage. This was due partly to lack of skill and capital, partly to the penal laws which caused a widespread feeling of insecurity and prevented Catholic farmers from taking up profitable tenures, and partly to the import of bounty-fed English corn which discouraged the idea of producing it for the home market. On the whole, till the middle of the eighteenth century the people were reduced to extreme poverty. After that date the growth of the linen industry did something to ameliorate their condition.

The chapters describing financial relations are not as clear nor as thorough as those dealing with commercial affairs. Indeed, the author does little more than confirm what we already knew, and describe in some detail the corruption that prevailed in the administration of the revenues. Her claim that through the military establishment and pension list Ireland materially contributed to the expansion of the empire can hardly be allowed. By her own account such abuses prevailed in both that the evil seems to have outweighed the good.

The author agrees with Dr. Cunningham in believing that England's policy toward Ireland was not dictated by malignancy. The Whig government feared that a rich and prosperous Ireland would endanger English liberties by increasing the power of the crown. To this was added the belief that for purposes of defense England's resources were to be fostered even to the detriment of her neighbor. The former reason was more potent in the seventeenth, the latter in the eighteenth, century. Throughout the period, hatred of Catholicism counteracted the sympathy that might have been felt in England for the suffering caused by repressive legislation. The repeal of this legislation was due to neither good-will nor enlightened conception of national interests. Every concession by which the rigor of the old system was ameliorated was wrung by grinding necessity from an unwilling Parliament.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century Protestants and

Catholics were almost equally alienated from England; their common sufferings drew them together into opposition, and a sentiment of Irish nationality began to awaken. Natives of both religions joined in the agitation for free trade that grew out of the unprecedented distress caused by the American war. Until this time the Irish Parliament had been merely an institution for registering the edicts of the English Privy Council; it now became, under the leadership of the celebrated Grattan, an agency for propagating the doctrine of economic and political independence. On the failure of Pitt's plan to afford relief, due to the opposition of the English manufacturing towns, the agitation became violent. It was feared that the volunteer companies formed for defense against French invasion might take the same course as the American militia. Even the English manufacturers were brought to terms by non-importation associations. Under these circumstances the more oppressive restrictions were repealed in 1779 and 1780. But the freedom of trade did little to remedy the distress at a time when England was at war with most of the world. Moreover, Ireland felt that the concession must be precarious, as long as it might be withdrawn at the will of the English Parliament. The agitation was continued, therefore, with legislative independence as its object. The result was that the fusion government under Fox repealed the notorious act of 6 Geo. I and in January, 1783, the British Parliament explicitly renounced all legal and judicial supremacy over Ireland.

The author, in our opinion, somewhat exaggerates the prosperity of Ireland following the acquisition of independence. But she cannot exaggerate the disastrous economic results of the Act of Union. She points out that the two islands were too unequal in economic condition for the same commercial system to benefit both. Ireland lost the chance to develop her infant industries by protection. She was totally unprepared for free trade at the time that for England it was the most enlightened policy to pursue. She had no capital to take advantage of the new machinery and processes, and therefore she fell relatively farther behind in industrial development.

The author surveys briefly the slow transition to better things in the nineteenth century, and reaches the conclusion that the worst is past. The encouragement of agriculture, rural industries, co-operation, and the recent Land Act promise well, so that in forecasting the future her tone is decidedly optimistic.

THOMAS WALKER PAGE.